



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,694	12/04/2003	Roy Hirst	MS305475.1/MSFTP492US	8657
27195	7590	11/14/2008		
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP			EXAMINER	
127 Public Square			LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
57th Floor, Key Tower				
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,694

Applicant(s)

HIRST, ROY

Examiner

MATTHEW J. LUDWIG

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination received 9/4/2008.
2. Claims 1-4, 7-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 19, 20, 27, and 28 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1-4 and 7-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Denning have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-4, 7-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hohl 'Hypadapter: An Adaptive Hypertext System for Exploratory Learning and Programming', 1996, pages 131-156.**

In reference to independent claim 1, Hohl teaches:

'a quality component that tracks one or more quality metrics associated with one or more items in a documentation set, the one or more items include topics or subtopics

a rules engine that automatically applies the quality metrics to the items to facilitate interactive quality assessments of the items and bulk remediation of a quality problem across disparate items to improve the quality of the documentation set wherein quality is a

measurable function of document accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability, the bulk remediation includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the one or more items; a scoring component that automatically ranks the items based at least in part on the interactive quality assessments of the items; and at least one filter that analyzes quality scores in view of a predetermined threshold of quality, the at least one filter extracts attributes from an item with a score that exceeds the predetermined threshold and automatically applies the attributes to the remaining items¹. See Abstract, page 140 - figure 6, and pages 142-146.

The reference to Hohl provides a means of locating technical documentation sets and providing articles found by the search to the user. The method further determines an importance value for a retrieved technical document via monitoring at least one of visible technical documentation, search engine activity. It provides usefulness of links denoting special types of programming operations from left (most relevant) to right (least relevant) and is visually reflected in the order of links and the use of different font sizes. Page 146 and 147 disclose a scoring component, ranking methods, and filters utilized with the interactive system of Hohl.

In reference to independent claim 2, Hohl teaches:

A system that generates individualized presentations of topic nodes and provides adaptive navigational assistance for link-based browsing. See Abstract.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Hohl teaches:

Optimization rule topics describe transformation rules for optimizing program code according to the guidelines specified by goal-topics. These topics can be applied by code optimization components. See page 144.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Holh teaches:

Whenever a topic is added to the menu of bookmarks by the user it is also put high on a list of topics of high priority maintained by the user model. These topics, which might become potentially relevant or interesting for the user in the near future, have a direct influence on the presentation of link attributes. See page 146 and 147.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Holh teaches:

Figure 11 illustrates global controls related to stereotypes associated with the user model and score information based upon analysis. See page 147, figure 11.

In reference to dependent claim 8-10, Hohl teaches:

An adaptive hypertext system which includes rules for analyzing quality metrics and respective items. See page 147 and 148.

In reference to dependent claim 11, Hohl teaches:

A means of statistical analysis used within the model for topics/items. See page 147 and figure 11, Evaluating topic attributes and links.

In reference to dependent claim 12, Hohl teaches:

Figure 8 illustrates a user interface to analyze and process quality metrics and score components. See page 142, figure 8.

In reference to dependent claim 13, Hohl teaches:

Figure 8 illustrates scores displayed and associated with an item which facilitates manual computing based upon collected information for the item. See page 142, figure 8.

In reference to dependent claim 14, Hohl teaches:

Whenever a topic is added to the menu of bookmarks by the user it is also put high on a list of topics of high priority maintained by the user model. These topics, which might become potentially relevant or interesting for the user, have a direct influence on presentation of link attributes. See page 146 and 147.

In reference to dependent claim 15, Hohl teaches:

Item topics that associated with items and illustrated within figure 8 on page 142, Barney's User model Inspector. See page 142 and figure 8.

In reference to dependent claim 16, Hohl teaches:

The claim recites 'electronic identifier' as it relates to the items of dependent claim 15. The Examiner used an item topic from the list of options within dependent claim 14 and not an electronic identifier. See dependent claim 15.

In reference to dependent claim 17, Hohl teaches:

Figure 8 illustrates a display means to track results of measuring online access to a documentation set over time. See page 142, figure 8.

In reference to claims 18, 20, 27, and 28, the claims recite similar language found in independent claim 1. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to independent claim 19, Hohl teaches:

As presently claimed, the limitations recite similar language found within independent claim 1. The phrase 'common issues' which could be found throughout independent claim 19 is not addressed in the rejection of claim 1. Therefore, the examiner would like to point out that Hohl discloses an essential property of Hypadapter which is its ability to adapt presentations of

topics and links to individual users. The system acts as an adaptive visual information filter that dynamically highlights relevant information and puts less important aspects in the background. Thereby, the system not only adapts to different users but also takes the user's individual learning progress into account. The system identifies characteristics about a user, and determines common attributes based upon topics within the software presentation. See page 138-139 and 142-146.

In reference to claims 21-27, the claims recite similar language found in claims 1-17. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 7-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant made amendments to the claims which required the examiner to withdrawal the rejection of Denning and modify the rejection accordingly.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW J. LUDWIG whose telephone number is (571)272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2178

ML